

2020-07

# Plant volatiles induced by herbivore eggs prime defences and mediate shifts in the reproductive strategy of receiving plants

Pashalidou, FG

<http://hdl.handle.net/10026.1/16263>

---

10.1111/ele.13509

Ecology Letters

Wiley

---

*All content in PEARL is protected by copyright law. Author manuscripts are made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the details provided on the item record or document. In the absence of an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher or author.*

**Plant volatiles induced by herbivore eggs prime defenses and mediate shifts in the reproductive strategy of receiving plants**

Foteini G. Pashalidou<sup>1,2</sup>, Lisa Eyman<sup>1</sup>, James Sims<sup>1</sup>, James Buckley<sup>1</sup>, Nina E. Fatouros<sup>3</sup>, Consuelo M. De Moraes<sup>1</sup>, Mark C. Mescher<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Environmental Systems Science, ETH Zürich, 8092, Zürich, Switzerland

<sup>2</sup> UMR Agronomie, INRAE, AgroParisTech, Université Paris-Saclay, 78850, Thiverval-Grignon, France

<sup>3</sup> Biosystematics Group, Wageningen University, Droevendaalsesteeg 1, 6708 PB Wageningen, Netherlands

Email addresses: foteini.paschalidou@inra.fr , lisa.eymann@gmx.ch , james.sims@usys.ethz.ch , [james.buckley@env.ethz.ch](mailto:james.buckley@env.ethz.ch) , nina.fatouros@wur.nl, consuelo.demoraes@usys.ethz.ch, mark.mescher@usys.ethz.ch

\* corresponding author: mcmescher@usys.ethz.ch, tel: +41 44 632 39 30

**Short running title:** volatile cues alter plant defense and reproduction

**Data accessibility:** Should the manuscript be accepted the data will be archived in an appropriate repository (DataDryad).

**Keywords:** herbivore performance, cues, defense, priming, oviposition-induced plant volatiles, herbivore-induced plant volatiles, fitness, *Brassica*, defense, *Pieris brassicae*

**Statement of authorship:** FGP, JB, NEF, MCM, and CDM designed the study; FGP, JS and LE conducted the experiments; JS, LE and CDM conducted the chemical analyses, FGP and LE conducted the statistical analyses; FGP wrote the first draft of the manuscript and all authors contributed significantly to revisions.

**Type of article:** Letter

Number of words in abstract: 140

Number of words in main text = 4966

Number of references = 61

Number of figures and tables = 5 figures only

## ABSTRACT

Plants can detect cues associated with the risk of future herbivory and modify defense phenotypes accordingly; however, our current understanding is limited both with respect to the range of early warning cues to which plants respond and the nature of the responses. Here we report that exposure to volatile emissions from plant tissues infested with herbivore eggs promotes stronger defense responses to subsequent herbivory in two *Brassica* species. Furthermore, exposure to these volatile cues elicited an apparent shift from growth to reproduction in *Brassica nigra*, with exposed plants exhibiting increased flower and seed production, but reduced leaf production, relative to unexposed controls. Our results thus document plant defense priming in response to a novel environmental cue, oviposition-induced plant volatiles, while also showing that plant responses to early warning cues can include changes in both defense and life-history traits.

## INTRODUCTION

Plants face inevitable trade-offs when investing in defense versus growth and reproduction, as well as among defense traits that may be effective against different classes of antagonists (Zangerl & Rutledge 1996; Cipollini & Heil 2010). Where the risk of encountering particular antagonists is unpredictable, these trade-offs may be mitigated via inducible defenses that postpone the commitment of resources until a plant comes under attack (Karban & Myers 1989; Agrawal 1999; Orrock *et al.* 2015); however, this strategy entails a period of vulnerability during the time required to effectively deploy defenses following induction (Karban 2011). Plants can shorten this period by adjusting their defense phenotypes in response to early warning cues—detected prior to attack—that provide information about the risk of encountering herbivores or pathogens (Dicke & Baldwin 2010; Hilker & Fatouros 2015; Mescher & De Moraes 2015). It is now clear that the recognition of

such cues is widespread and that plant responses to such cues often entail defense priming rather than full-scale defense induction (van Hulten *et al.* 2006; Frost *et al.* 2008a; Kim & Felton 2013; Conrath *et al.* 2015; Dicke 2016; Hilker *et al.* 2016). Nevertheless, our understanding remains limited both with respect to the range of early warning cues that plants recognize and the nature of their responses.

Work on plant responses to the threat of herbivore attack has identified a range of cues that appear to prime plant defenses. These include cues directly associated with herbivores, such as herbivore movement on leaf surfaces (Peiffer *et al.* 2009), the presence of insect eggs on plant tissues (Beyaert *et al.* 2012; Bandoly *et al.* 2016; Hilker & Fatouros 2016; Lortzing *et al.* 2019), and olfactory cues emitted by herbivores, such as pheromones (Helms *et al.* 2013; Helms *et al.* 2017; Bittner *et al.* 2019). In addition, plants may respond to indirect cues that reveal information about the presence of herbivores, most notably herbivore-induced volatile emissions from plant tissues that are already under attack, which have been shown to prime plant defenses in a wide range of systems (Heil & Kost 2006; Frost *et al.* 2008a; Dicke & Baldwin 2010; Karban *et al.* 2014) and which appear to play a signaling function within plants (Frost *et al.* 2007; Heil & Silva Bueno 2007), as well as serving as cues for neighboring plants of the same or different species (Karbon & Maron 2002; Kessler *et al.* 2006; Zhang *et al.* 2019).

The specific cues responsible for priming are often not known, although individual herbivore-induced plant volatile compounds responsible for priming have been identified in a handful of systems (Frost *et al.* 2008b; Sugimoto *et al.* 2014; Erb *et al.* 2015), as has an herbivore-emitted compound that primes defenses in goldenrod (Helms *et al.* 2013; Helms *et al.* 2017). The compounds identified by these studies are diverse, suggesting that plants can potentially detect a wide range of chemical cues. In addition to herbivore-induced volatiles, other indirect cues may provide plants with reliable information about the risks or impacts of

future herbivory. For example, there is evidence that abiotic factors, such as exposure to heavy metals or changes in weather conditions, can alter the sensitivity of defenses to future herbivore attack (Holopainen & Gershenzon 2010; Winter *et al.* 2012; Pezzola *et al.* 2017).

As noted above, the detection of early warning cues by plants often does not lead to full-scale defense induction, but rather to defense priming, which enables faster deployment of induced defenses following subsequent attack (Frost *et al.* 2008a; Kim & Felton 2013; Douma *et al.* 2017). For example, defense priming in response to both herbivore-induced plant volatiles and the volatile emissions of herbivores themselves have been shown to prime defense induction via the jasmonic acid pathway (Frost *et al.* 2008b; Helms *et al.* 2017). It is currently unclear whether similar underlying processes mediate the defense priming responses to disparate cues observed in different plant systems.

In a few systems early warning cues have been shown to elicit responses that enhance plant resistance against herbivores via direct or indirect defense mechanisms. For example, tomato plants can convert the volatile (Z)-3-hexenol from damaged neighboring plants to (Z)-3-hexenylvicinioside, a form of chemical defense that directly reduces herbivore performance (Sugimoto *et al.* 2014). Meanwhile, plants infested with herbivore eggs emit volatile compounds that attract egg or early-stage larval parasitoids, an effective indirect form of defense (Hilker & Fatouros 2015), and egg infestation itself has been associated with an enhanced physiological defense response upon herbivore feeding (Bandoly *et al.* 2016; Lortzing *et al.* 2019), perhaps mediated by the detection of chemical cues in the egg-glue or in oviduct secretions covering the eggs (Hilker & Fatouros 2015).

While most work on plant responses to early warning cues has focused on defense, plant responses to herbivore feeding often include changes in growth or life-history traits that can enhance plant tolerance or otherwise mitigate the fitness impacts of herbivory (Strauss & Agrawal 1999; Agrawal 2000; Carmona *et al.* 2011; Garcia & Eubanks 2019). For example,

plants can invest more resources in vegetative growth and reproduction (Garcia & Eubanks 2019), or accelerate flowering and fruit production (a strategy referred to as reproductive escape; Lucas-Barbosa *et al.* 2013). There is also evidence that plants can respond to severe herbivore attack by deferring reproduction to future growing seasons and shifting current investment to resistant belowground tissues (Schwachtje *et al.* 2006). It is therefore plausible that cues detected prior to attack might elicit similar changes in plant traits not directly related to defense. To date, however, only a few studies have documented changes in plant growth or reproductive traits in response to cues that provide an early warning of herbivore attack. For example, sagebrush exposed to cues from damaged neighbors increased production of inflorescences and lateral branches at the expense of vertical growth (Karban *et al.* 2012; Karban 2017), while tobacco plants exposed to damaged (manually clipped) sagebrush neighbors produced more flowers and seeds than plants with undamaged neighbors (Karban & Maron 2002). Exposure to the putative sex pheromone of a gall inducing fly was also shown to increase short-term growth in goldenrod plants (Yip *et al.* 2017).

The current study explores how the annual brassicaceous plant *Brassica nigra* responds to early warning cues associated with the presence of a specialist herbivore, *Pieris brassicae*. Herbivory by *P. brassicae* can impose high fitness costs on *Brassica nigra*, which has therefore evolved specialized defense responses (Blatt *et al.* 2008). These include responses to oviposition, which has been shown to prime *B. nigra* defenses under both greenhouse and field conditions (Pashalidou *et al.* 2013; Pashalidou *et al.* 2015a; Pashalidou *et al.* 2015b; Pashalidou *et al.* 2015c). Plants infested with *P. brassicae* eggs were also found to flower earlier and produce significantly more seeds than control plants (Lucas-Barbosa *et al.* 2013; Pashalidou *et al.* 2015b) and to emit volatiles that recruit larval parasitoids (Pashalidou *et al.* 2013; Pashalidou *et al.* 2015b). Recent studies in other systems have also reported effects of volatiles induced by herbivore oviposition, including enhanced parasitoid attraction in

teosinte (Mutyambai *et al.* 2016) and decreased herbivore recruitment in poplar (Guo *et al.* 2019). In light of these findings, we hypothesized that it might be adaptive for *B. nigra* plants themselves to detect and respond to volatile cues associated with the presence of *P. brassicae* eggs.

We therefore aimed to determine whether *B. nigra* plants respond to oviposition-induced volatile cues and to characterize the effects of such cues on both plant defense and life-history traits. To achieve this, we first tested whether defense priming by oviposition-induced volatiles from neighbors results in reduced larval performance on focal plants (a proxy for defense resistance). Next, we sampled the headspace of control and egg-infested plants to identify potential oviposition-induced volatile cues emitted by *Brassica nigra* (as well as the related species *Brassica oleracea*, a perennial commercial crop plant) and tested the effects of exposure to a key compound found to be upregulated by the presence of eggs. Finally, we assessed whether oviposition-induced volatiles from neighbors can elicit changes in *B. nigra* life history traits similar to those previously observed in response to direct egg deposition. Our results demonstrate that exposure to oviposition-induced volatiles reduces the subsequent performance of *P. brassicae* larvae and also results in apparent shift from growth to reproduction (exposed plants produced more flowers and seeds but fewer leaves than unexposed controls). These findings confirm that plants use oviposition-induced volatiles as an early warning cue of herbivory, and that exposure to these volatiles influences both defense-related and life-history traits.

## **MATERIALS & METHODS**

### **Plants and insects**

This study examines two brassicaceous plant species, the wild annual *Brassica nigra*, and the cultivated perennial *Brassica oleracea*. *Brassica nigra* is native to many European

countries (Lauber & Wagner, 2012). Seeds for this study were provided by the Centre of Genetic Resources in Wageningen, the Netherlands (accession number: CGN06619). The seeds were collected from plants grown in field sites around Wageningen, which were exposed to wild pollinators; these seeds were then used to grow plants in the greenhouse for our experiments. *Brassica oleracea* var. *capitata* (white cabbage) is endemic to the southern and western coast of Europe and is now grown worldwide as an agricultural crop. White cabbage seeds from the commercial variety “ESCAZU” (seed lot 2875500) were provided by Syngenta Crop Protection AG (Basel, Switzerland). Plants of both species were grown in standard potting soil (Substrat 2, Klasmann-Deilmann GmbH, Germany) in a climate chamber under warm, long-day conditions (light 24°C, dark 22°C, L16h-D8h, 60% relative humidity).

Herbivore assays were conducted with larvae of the Large Cabbage White butterfly, *Pieris brassicae* (Lepidoptera: Pieridae), a globally distributed species that specializes on plants in the Brassicaceae family. Butterflies used in this experiment were collected in Switzerland and reared under similar conditions as the plants (light 24°C, dark 22°C, L16h-D8h, 60% relative humidity).

### **Generating the experimental treatments**

For each of the subsequent experiments with the two *Brassica* species, we used four “priming” treatments (Fig. 1, Table S1), including: (i) plants infested with *P. brassicae* eggs (E); (ii) plants receiving volatiles from egg-infested neighbors (Re); control receivers exposed to volatiles from uninfested neighbors at close proximity (Rc); and unmanipulated controls (C). Plants in the first treatment (E) were individually placed in cages with ~50 mated *P. brassicae* females and left until at least 40 eggs were laid (~15 minutes). Excess eggs were gently removed with a fine brush (uninfested emitters were also brushed), and the remaining eggs stayed on the plant until larval emergence (five days later). Plants in the



second treatment (Re) were placed ~15cm from plants in treatment E (for volatile exposure) but removed prior to larval emergence. Control receiver plants (Rc) were similarly placed ~15cm away from uninfested plants. Unmanipulated control plants (C) were grown farther apart (>25cm) to minimize effects of volatile exposure. After five days, but prior to larval emergence, plants in these four treatments were moved to random positions, and the spacing between plants was increased to ~25cm. After larvae hatched on E plants, they were removed and then used for subsequent damage treatments (with or without larvae, as discussed below) (Fig. 1). Unique plants sets were used for each experiment described below.

### ***Larval performance bioassays***

The effect of exposure to oviposition-induced volatiles on plant defenses in both *Brassica* species was assessed via larval performance assays on non-flowering plants. Ten plants from each priming treatment (E, Re, Rc and C) received 10 neonate *P. brassicae*. On days three and seven following the initiation of feeding, larval mass was measured on a microbalance (accuracy +/- 1µg; Mettler- Toledo AG, Greifensee, Switzerland) as described in Pashalidou et al. (2013, 2015a, c).

### ***Volatile collection and analysis***

For both *Brassica nigra* and *Brassica oleracea*, we collected volatiles from plants exposed to the four priming treatments (N=12 per treatment) and with or without larval damage. For damage treatments, ten L1 larvae were placed on E, Re and Rc plants. Due to logistical constraints (and because our previous assays showed no effect of priming treatment Rc on larval performance) we collected volatiles only from damaged Rc plants and used C plants as undamaged controls. Larvae were placed on the adaxial side of the 3<sup>rd</sup> highest leaf. One damaged plant was excluded from the damaged Re treatment because of unrelated

damage. Volatile collections were made one day prior to larval emergence and two hours after the initiation of larval feeding. Pots were wrapped in foil to minimize plastic contaminants. Two connecting metal plates were closed around the plant stem (with a hole for the stem to pass), and cotton was used to seal gaps. A 30 L glass dome was carefully placed over the leafy parts of the plant, with openings for incoming and outgoing air, which was filtered through activated charcoal, pulled through the chamber at a rate of 150 ml/min for 4 h, and collected in a stainless-steel cartridge containing 200 mg of Tenex TA (20/35 mesh; CAMSO, Houston, TX, USA). Due to space limitations, volatile collections were conducted in three blocks. After volatile collection, the aboveground parts of the plant were cut and weighed.

Volatile compounds were eluted from the filter using 150  $\mu$ L of internal standard solution (2 ng/ $\mu$ L octane and 4 ng/ $\mu$ L nonyl acetate in dichlormethane) and the eluant was analysed by gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS). Two  $\mu$ L of the eluant was injected with an automatic Agilent injector 7693 autosampler (Santa Clara, CA, USA) to an Agilent 7890B GC (Santa Clara, CA, USA) with a pulsed splitless inlet at 250°C, which was held for 2min and then analyzed on the connected MS Agilent 5977A. Compounds were quantified and identified as described in supplementary methods (Appendix S1). Volatile emissions per plant were calculated as mean peak area divide by both the fresh weight of foliage (in grams) and by  $10^4$  the  $n$  of samples.

### ***Testing effects of exposure to individual volatile compounds***

Because the emission of cumene was significantly elevated on egg-infested plants for *B. oleracea* (Table S2), we also explored the defense priming effects of this compound on *B. oleracea* and *B. nigra*. Unfortunately, we were unable to similarly test the effect of  $\beta$ -thujene—a compound showing elevated emissions following egg infestation in *B. nigra* (Table S3)—as we could not obtain this compound. We made a cumene solution containing 156 $\mu$ g/ml of

synthetic cumene (Sigma-Aldrich) in hexane, a concentration approximating the mean daily emission of an egg-infested plant with a fresh aboveground mass of 200g. Over a five-day period, 50 $\mu$ L of this solution was applied daily to sleeve-stopper septa (Sigma-Aldrich) placed at a distance of 15cm from focal plants (treatment Cu; Table S1). The septa were placed at the height of the receiver's apical meristem to simulate elevated cumene emission from an egg-infested plant. Control plants were similarly exposed to 50 $\mu$ L hexane (treatment He). Each of the 10 replicate plants per treatment was infested with 10 neonate larvae after exposure to cumene for five days, and larvae were weighed three and seven days after placement.

### **Testing effects of egg-induced volatiles on plant growth and reproduction**

To test whether priming by oviposition-induced volatiles altered plant reproductive output we focused on *Brassica nigra*, as this annual species has been previously shown to respond to egg infestation through changes in reproductive phenology. We produced new plants using six treatments described in previous sections (C, E and Re with and without larval damage; Fig. 1, Table S1), omitting Rc plants which were similar to C plants in previous assays. Larvae were allowed to feed freely until pupation, with the larval number reduced from ten to three at the third instar stage to avoid complete defoliation. When larvae neared pupation, plants were covered with a fine net (to prevent larvae from leaving the plant), which was removed following pupation (plant treatments without larvae were similarly covered). We recorded the number of leaves and flowers present three weeks after the first flower appeared on each plant. Once all plants were flowering, commercial bumblebees (Biobest, Switzerland) were introduced for three weeks to ensure pollination; previous work indicates that bumblebees do not discriminate between undamaged plants and those with either *P. brassicae* eggs or feeding damage on leaves/flowers (Lucas-Barbosa *et al.* 2013). After plants had completed their life

cycle, ripe seeds were collected from each plant and measured with a seed counter (elmor c3 version 1.1, Switzerland). Germination rates were measured as in Pashalidou et al 2015b.

## **Statistical analyses**

Caterpillar weights were log-transformed to satisfy normality and the effect of different treatments analyzed with a General Linear Model (GLM) using restricted maximum likelihood (REML). Germination rates, as well as numbers of flowers and seeds, were also log-transformed to satisfy normality and analysed with a LMM using REML (Bates *et al.* 2014) with R Software version 3.3.1. Treatments were defined as fixed effects, and inter-plant variation in reproductive/growth traits was modeled using a random effect of plant replicate. The significance of differences between treatments was evaluated with a Tukey's post hoc test.

A principal component analysis on the raw chemical data was performed with the statistical software JMP® 11.1.1 of SAS Institute. The effects of the single compounds (mean-centered and log-transformed) were tested with a GLM using REML in R statistical software, with treatment as a fixed factor and repetition as a random factor. For compounds with significant treatment effects, the Tukey-Anscombe plot was used to check for normality of the error, and the Q-Q plot was used to check for normal distribution of residuals. *P*-values were corrected for multiple comparisons with the Bonferroni adjustment. If the log transformation did not manage to satisfy the assumption of the GLM a nonparametric Wilcoxon / Kruskal-Wallis Test (Rank Sums) was performed in JMP.

## **RESULTS**

### **Oviposition-induced plant volatiles prime plant defenses**

Larvae feeding on *B. oleracea* plants previously exposed to eggs (E) or to volatiles from egg-infested plants (Re) had significantly lower biomass after three and seven days feeding than

larvae feeding on control plants (C), or those exposed to volatiles from control plants (Rc) (3 days:  $F = 11.1$ ,  $P < 0.001$ , 7 days:  $F = 13.4$ ,  $P < 0.001$ , Appendix S2a,b, Fig. 2a). Similarly, larvae feeding on *B. nigra* plants were also negatively affected by plant exposure to eggs or volatiles from egg-infested plants (3 days:  $F = 24.3$ ,  $P < 0.001$ , 7 days:  $F = 43.6$ ,  $P < 0.001$ , Appendix S3a, b, Fig. 2c).

### **The presence of eggs on leaves upregulates specific volatile compounds**

In total, 39 volatile compounds were detected for *Brassica nigra* and 40 for *Brassica oleracea* across all experimental treatments and time points. Principal components analysis of volatile emissions did not show clear multivariate divergence among treatments (Fig. S1). In *Brassica oleracea*, most compounds (39/40) did not significantly differ among treatments after controlling for multiple testing using Bonferroni correction (Table S2); however, cumene was emitted in significantly higher amounts from egg-infested (E) plants than from plants in any other treatment ( $t$ -value = 2.46,  $df = 25$ ,  $P = 0.02$ , Fig. 3a). In *Brassica nigra*, a different compound,  $\beta$ -thujene, was the single compound emitted in significantly larger amounts from plants induced by egg deposition (E) compared to all other treatments ( $t$ -value=2.36,  $df = 34$ ,  $P = 0.024$ ; Fig. 3b; Table S3).

### **Cumene primes defences in *B. oleracea***

Because our volatile analyses identified clear effects of eggs on volatile emissions, we next explored the effects of the relevant compounds on defense priming. We found that *P. brassicae* larvae feeding on *B. oleracea* plants previously exposed to cumene, the single compound upregulated by *P. brassicae* eggs in this plant species, had significantly lower biomass than larvae feeding on plants exposed to hexane alone after 7 days of feeding (after 3 days:  $F = 0.6$ ,  $P = 0.42$ ; after 7 days:  $F = 7.1$ ,  $P = 0.02$ ; Appendix S4a,b; Fig. 2b). By contrast, larvae feeding on *B. nigra* plants previously exposed to cumene exhibited no significant differences in

biomass from larvae feeding on plants exposed only to hexane at either time point (3 days:  $F = 0.8$ ,  $P = 0.35$ ; 7 days:  $F = 1.7$ ,  $P = 0.18$ ; Appendix S5a,b; Fig. 2d). It thus appears that cumene functions as a species-specific priming signal in *B. oleracea*.  $\beta$ -thujene, the compound similarly upregulated by eggs on *B. nigra* plants, may play a similar role for that species; however, we were unable to test the effects of  $\beta$ -thujene on priming, as this compound could not be commercially obtained and was challenging to synthesize.

### **Oviposition-induced plant volatiles shift plant reproductive strategies in *B. nigra***

Compared to undamaged controls (C), undamaged *Brassica nigra* plants infested with eggs (E) and those exposed to volatiles from egg-infested plants (Re) produced significantly higher numbers of flowers ( $F = 10.6$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ; Appendix S6; Fig. 4a), fewer leaves ( $F = 4.64$ ,  $P = 0.002$ ; Appendix S7; Fig. 4b), and more seeds ( $F = 8.3$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ; Appendix S8; Fig. 4c), indicating a possible shift in growth-reproduction strategy. No similar effects were observed among damaged treatments, although there was a trend toward greater flower production by damaged E and Re plants compared to damaged control plants (Fig. 4). Germination rates of resulting seeds did not significantly differ between treatments ( $F = 1.75$ ,  $P = 0.14$ ; Fig. 4d).

## **DISCUSSION**

Our results show plant resistance to herbivory can be enhanced by prior exposure to volatile emissions from plant tissues infested with herbivore eggs, suggesting that oviposition-induced plant volatiles may play a role in priming plant defenses similar to that of other early warning cues directly and indirectly associated with the presence of herbivores. However, we also found that exposure to oviposition-induced volatiles elicited changes in life history traits not directly related to defense (Fig. 5). Specifically, we observed a shift from investment in growth to reproduction in *B. nigra* plants exposed to oviposition-induced volatiles similar to

that seen in plants directly infested with eggs, in both the current study and previous work (Pashalidou *et al.* 2015b). These findings thus have implications, which we discuss in more detail below, for understanding both the breadth of early warning cues to which plants respond and the nature of those responses.

### ***Oviposition-induced volatiles prime anti-herbivore defenses***

Defense priming has previously been reported in response to direct cues from herbivores, including egg deposition (Hilker & Fatouros 2015; Bandoly *et al.* 2016; Lortzing *et al.* 2019), as well as indirect cues in the form of damage-induced volatiles from neighboring plants (Engelberth *et al.* 2004; Ton *et al.* 2007; Frost *et al.* 2008a; Mescher & De Moraes 2015). The current results suggest that oviposition-induced volatiles can also prime plant defenses; this finding complements other recent work showing that oviposition-induced volatiles also play a communicative function in indirect plant defense by serving as foraging cues for natural enemies of herbivores, as well as herbivores themselves. For example, both egg and larval parasitoids showed a stronger preference for maize plants exposed to volatiles of plants infested by eggs of the herbivore *Chilo partellus* than control plants (Mutiyambai *et al.* 2016). Ovipositing herbivores were also seen to avoid poplar plants exposed to volatiles from egg-infested neighbors (Guo *et al.* 2019).

We found that the presence of eggs on leaves upregulated levels of different terpenoid compounds for each of our two focal species:  $\beta$ -thujene for *B. nigra* and cumene for *B. oleracea*. Furthermore, we found that exposure to cumene alone was sufficient to prime defenses in *B. oleracea*. We were unfortunately unable to obtain  $\beta$ -thujene for testing; however, cumene did not prime defenses in *B. nigra*, suggesting that there is species-level specificity in oviposition-induced volatile signaling systems. A number of studies have now identified specific volatile cues induced by feeding insects that act as a priming stimuli for neighboring

plants (Engelberth *et al.* 2004; Kost & Heil 2006; Frost *et al.* 2008b; Sugimoto *et al.* 2014; Erb *et al.* 2015), yet few studies have assessed the potential generality or specificity of these volatile cues across different species. For example, exposure to herbivore-induced indole clearly altered volatile profiles emitted by maize, but had a much weaker effect on cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum*) or cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata*) (Erb *et al.* 2015). The current results suggest that volatile signals associated with defense priming can vary even among closely related plant species responding to the same herbivore antagonist. It would be interesting to test whether the specific compounds implicated here (cumene and  $\beta$ -thujene) might also serve as important cues for herbivores and their natural enemies, particularly as *P. brassicae* females have been shown to use oviposition-induced volatile cues to avoid plants harboring conspecific eggs (Fatouros *et al.* 2012).

As in other systems where volatile cues produced by conspecifics prime defenses, it is unclear whether oviposition-induced volatile cues function primarily in interactions within or between plants and, to the extent that plants do respond to cues from neighbors, whether this represents between-plant communication or merely eavesdropping (Heil & Silva Bueno 2007; Dicke & Baldwin 2010). *Brassica* spp. often grow in dense stands across which herbivores, including later instars of specialists like *Pieris brassicae*, can readily move (Lucas-Barbosa *et al.* 2013; Pashalidou *et al.* 2013), suggesting that defense priming (or shifts in reproductive strategy, as discussed below) in response to herbivore-associated cues from neighboring plants might be adaptive. Furthermore, because these plants often grow in close proximity to close relatives, such responses might also enhance the inclusive fitness of the emitter. On the other hand, as the young gregarious larvae of *Pieris brassicae* do not move to neighboring plants until they reach later larval stages (Lucas-Barbosa *et al.* 2013), such cues might not always indicate that herbivory is imminent; however, such cues might still serve to indicate increased risk that the receiving plants will also be targeted for oviposition.



### ***Oviposition-induced volatile cues mediate changes in life-history strategy***

In addition to priming or inducing defenses, plants exposed to the threat of herbivory can alter their reproductive strategies to minimize impacts on fitness (Strauss & Agrawal 1999; Lucas-Barbosa *et al.* 2013). We found that plants exposed to oviposition-induced volatiles from neighboring plants produced more flowers and seeds, but fewer leaves, than control plants, a response similar to that previously reported for plants directly exposed to eggs (Lucas-Barbosa *et al.* 2013; Pashalidou *et al.* 2015b). To our knowledge, no previous studies have reported shifts in plant reproductive strategy following exposure to oviposition-induced volatiles. However, there is evidence for life history shifts in response to damage-induced volatiles in a few systems; for example, tobacco plants with clipped sagebrush neighbors produced more flowers and seeds than plants with unclipped neighbors (Karban & Maron 2002).

The increased seed production observed in undamaged *B. nigra* plants exposed to oviposition-induced volatiles (or to eggs) was lost when larvae were allowed to feed on the plants, although a trend towards greater flower production persisted—we did not measure seed mass in the present study, but previous field data revealed no differences in seed mass between uninfested plants and plants infested with *P. brassicae* eggs and larvae, despite differences in seed number (Pashalidou *et al.* 2015b). The fitness implications of the observed reproductive shifts are thus difficult to interpret, especially as even herbivory itself did not reduce seed production in damaged control plants (i.e., those not exposed to eggs or oviposition-induced volatiles). However, it appears that the onset of herbivory by the specialist *P. brassicae* (or exposure to herbivore-associated cues) mediates a shift to reproduction in *B. nigra*, perhaps with implications for fitness not captured in the context of our controlled greenhouse studies. In a previous field study (Pashalidou *et al.* 2015b), we did observe increased seed production by plants primed by eggs (relative to unprimed plants), perhaps due to higher parasitism rates

documented for *P. brassicae* larvae feeding on these plants—which in turn might be explained by longer larval development times on primed plants (Pashalidou et al., 2015a).

We did not directly assess flowering phenology, but evidence from previous work in this system suggests that the presence of *P. brassicae* eggs on leaves induces faster flowering relative to control plants (Pashalidou *et al.* 2013), which might serve as another means of reproductive escape from herbivory (Lucas-Barbosa *et al.* 2013). Plants are widely known to alter their flowering phenology in response to a wide range of abiotic and biotic stressors (Kazan & Lyons 2016), and such responses might plausibly help plants maintain their reproductive output in the face of herbivore attack, either by maximizing reproduction prior to tissue loss, delaying reproduction until the threat of herbivory has passed (particularly in the case of herbivores that feed directly on flowers), or shifting reproductive effort from the male to female function (i.e., via pollen transfer). The alternative hypothesis that the observed increase in flower production reflects manipulation by the herbivore, *P. brassicae*, which frequently feeds on flowers, is not supported by our previous findings that prior exposure to eggs, which has effects on both defense and life history similar to those reported here for exposure oviposition induced volatiles, had positive effects on plant fitness in the field while negatively affecting caterpillar performance (Pashalidou *et al.* 2015a,b).

## CONCLUSION

Our results demonstrate that plants can detect volatiles produced by egg-infested plants in their vicinity and that these volatiles not only prime defenses in the receiver plant, but also elicit striking changes in life history strategies, namely a rapid shift from growth to reproduction that may enhance fitness via reproductive escape. These findings complement other recent studies showing that cues other than damage-induced volatiles can prime plant defenses. In addition, they show that plant responses to early warning signals associated with

herbivory can extend to plant traits not directly related to defense.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work has been supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation under Grant No. 31003A-163145, ETH Zürich, and Dutch Research Council (NWO/TTW Vidi grant no. 14854)

## CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors state no conflicts of interest

## REFERENCES

1.  
Agrawal, A.A. (1999). Induced plant defense: evolution of induction and adaptive phenotypic plasticity. Inducible plant defenses against pathogens and herbivores: biochemistry, ecology, and agriculture. *American Phytopathological Society Press, St. Paul, MN*, 251-268.
2.  
Agrawal, A.A. (2000). Overcompensation of plants in response to herbivory and the by-product benefits of mutualism. *Trends Plant Sci*, 5, 309-313.
3.  
Bandoly, M., Grichnik, R., Hilker, M. & Steppuhn, A. (2016). Priming of anti-herbivore defence in *Nicotiana attenuata* by insect oviposition: herbivore-specific effects. *Plant Cell Environ*, 39, 848-859.
4.  
Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B. & Walker, S. (2014). *lme4: Linear mixed-effects models using Eigen and S4*. R package version 1.1-7.
5.  
Bergström, G., Rothschild, M., Groth, I. & Crighton, C. (1994). Oviposition by butterflies on young leaves: investigation of leaf volatiles. *Chemoecology*, 5/6, 147-158.
6.  
Beyaert, I., Kopke, D., Stiller, J., Hammerbacher, A., Yoneya, K., Schmidt, A. *et al.* (2012). Can insect egg deposition 'warn' a plant of future feeding damage by herbivorous larvae? *Proc R Soc B. Biol Sci*, 279, 101-108.
7. Bittner, N., Hundacker, J., Achotegui-Castells, A., Anderbrant, O. & Hilker, M. (2019). Defense of Scots pine against sawfly eggs (*Diprion pini*) is primed by exposure to sawfly sex pheromones. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 116, 24668-24675.
- 8  
Blatt, S.E., Smallegange, R.C., Hess, L., Harvey, J.A., Dicke, M. & van Loon, J.J.A. (2008). Tolerance of *Brassica nigra* to *Pieris brassicae* herbivory. *Botany*, 86, 641-648.
- 9.

476 Carmona, D., Lajeunesse, M.J. & Johnson, M.T.J. (2011). Plant traits that predict resistance  
477 to herbivores. *Funct Ecol*, 25, 358-367.

478 10.

479 Cipollini, D. & Heil, M. (2010). Costs and benefits of induced resistance to herbivores and  
480 pathogens in plants. *CAB Reviews: Perspectives in Agriculture, Veterinary Science,*  
481 *Nutrition and Natural Resources*, 5.

482 11.

483 Conrath, U., Beckers, G.J., Langenbach, C.J. & Jaskiewicz, M.R. (2015). Priming for  
484 enhanced defense. *Annu Rev Phytopathol*, 53, 97-119.

485 12.

486 Dicke, M. (2016). Plant phenotypic plasticity in the phytobiome: a volatile issue. *Curr Opin*  
487 *Plant Biol*, 32, 17-23.

488 13.

489 Dicke, M. & Baldwin, I.T. (2010). The evolutionary context for herbivore-induced plant  
490 volatiles: beyond the 'cry for help'. *Trends Plant Sci*, 15, 167-175.

491 14.

492 Douma, J.C., Vermeulen, P.J., Poelman, E.H., Dicke, M. & Anten, N.P.R. (2017). When does  
493 it pay off to prime for defense? A modeling analysis. *New Phytol*, 216, 782-797.

494 15.

495 Engelberth, J., Alborn, H.T., Schmelz, E.A. & Tumlinson, J.H. (2004). Airborne signals  
496 prime plants against insect herbivore attack. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 101, 1781-  
497 1785.

498 16.

499 Erb, M., Veyrat, N., Robert, C.A., Xu, H., Frey, M., Ton, J. *et al.* (2015). Indole is an  
500 essential herbivore-induced volatile priming signal in maize. *Nature Comm*, 6, 6273.

501 17.

502 Fatouros, N.E., Lucas-Barbosa, D., Weldegergis, B.T., Pashalidou, F.G., van Loon, J.J.,  
503 Dicke, M. *et al.* (2012). Plant volatiles induced by herbivore egg deposition affect  
504 insects of different trophic levels. *PloS one*, 7, e43607.

505 18.

506 Frost, C.J., Appel, H.M., Carlson, J.E., De Moraes, C.M., Mescher, M.C. & Schultz, J.C.  
507 (2007). Within-plant signalling via volatiles overcomes vascular constraints on  
508 systemic signalling and primes responses against herbivores. *Ecol Lett*, 10, 490-498.

509 19.

510 Frost, C.J., Mescher, M.C., Carlson, J.E. & De Moraes, C.M. (2008a). Plant defense priming  
511 against herbivores: getting ready for a different battle. *Plant Physiol*, 146, 818-824.

512 20.

513 Frost, C.J., Mescher, M.C., Dervinis, C., Davis, J.M., Carlson, J.E. & De Moraes, C.M.  
514 (2008b). Priming defense genes and metabolites in hybrid poplar by the green leaf  
515 volatile cis-3-hexenyl acetate. *New Phytol*, 180, 722-734.

516 21.

517 Garcia, L.C. & Eubanks, M. (2019). Overcompensation for insect herbivory: a review and  
518 meta-analysis of the evidence. *Ecology*, 100, e02585.

519 22.

520 Guo, L., Liu, F., Zhang, S., Kong, X. & Zhang, Z. (2019). Egg Deposition of  
521 *Micromelalopha sieversi* (Staudinger) on Clones of *Populus* from Section Aigeiros  
522 Induces Resistance in Neighboring Plants. *Forests*, 10.

523 23.

524 Heil, M. & Kost, C. (2006). Priming of indirect defences. *Ecol Lett*, 9, 813-817.

525

526 24.  
527 Heil, M. & Silva Bueno, J.C. (2007). Within-plant signaling by volatiles leads to induction  
528 and priming of an indirect plant defense in nature. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 104,  
529 5467-5472.

530 25.  
531 Helms, A.M., De Moraes, C.M., Tooker, J.F. & Mescher, M.C. (2013). Exposure of *Solidago*  
532 *altissima* plants to volatile emissions of an insect antagonist (*Eurosta solidaginis*)  
533 deters subsequent herbivory. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 110, 199-204.

534 26.  
535 Helms, A.M., De Moraes, C.M., Troger, A., Alborn, H.T., Francke, W., Tooker, J.F. *et al.*  
536 (2017). Identification of an insect-produced olfactory cue that primes plant defenses.  
537 *Nature Comm*, 8, 337.

538 27.  
539 Hilker, M. & Fatouros, N.E. (2015). Plant responses to insect egg deposition. *Annu Rev*  
540 *Entomol*, 60, 493-515.

541 28.  
542 Hilker, M. & Fatouros, N.E. (2016). Resisting the onset of herbivore attack: plants perceive  
543 and respond to insect eggs. *Curr Opin Plant Biol*, 32, 9-16.

544 29.  
545 Hilker, M., Schwachtje, J., Baier, M., Balazadeh, S., Bährle, I., Geiselhardt, S. *et al.* (2016).  
546 Priming and memory of stress responses in organisms lacking a nervous system. *Biol*  
547 *Rev*, 91, 1118-1133.

548 30.  
549 Holopainen, J.K. & Gershenzon, J. (2010). Multiple stress factors and the emission of plant  
550 VOCs. *Trends Plant Sci*, 15, 176-184.

551  
552 31.  
553 Karban, R. (2011). The ecology and evolution of induced resistance against herbivores. *Funct*  
554 *Ecol*, 25, 339-347.

555 32.  
556 Karban, R. (2017). Tradeoff between resistance induced by volatile communication and over-  
557 topping vertical growth. *Plant Signal Behav*, 12, e1309491.

558 33.  
559 Karban, R., Ishizaki, S. & Shiojiri, K. (2012). Long-term demographic consequences of  
560 eavesdropping for sagebrush. *J Ecol*, 100, 932-938.

561 34.  
562 Karban, R. & Maron, J.L. (2002). The fitness consequences of interspecific eavesdropping  
563 between plants. *Ecology*, 83, 1209-1213.

564 35.  
565 Karban, R. & Myers, J.H. (1989). Induced plant responses to herbivory. *Annu Rev Ecol Evol.*  
566 *Syst* 20, 331-348.

567  
568 36.  
569 Karban, R., Yang, L.H. & Edwards, K.F. (2014). Volatile communication between plants that  
570 affects herbivory: a meta-analysis. *Ecol Lett*, 17, 44-52.

571 37.  
572 Kazan, K. & Lyons, R. (2016). The link between flowering time and stress tolerance. *J Exp*  
573 *Bot*, 67, 47-60.

574 38.

575 Kessler, A., Halitschke, R., Diezel, C. & Baldwin, I.T. (2006). Priming of plant defense  
576 responses in nature by airborne signalling between *A. tridentata* and *N. attenuata*.  
577 *Oecologia*, 148, 280-292.

578 39.

579 Kim, J. & Felton, G.W. (2013). Priming of antiherbivore defensive responses in plants. *Insect*  
580 *Sci*, 20, 273-285.

581

582 40.

583 Kost, C. & Heil, M. (2006). Herbivore-induced plant volatiles induce an indirect defence in  
584 neighbouring plants. *J Ecol*, 94, 619-628.

585 41.

586 Lortzing, V., Oberlander, J., Lortzing, T., Tohge, T., Steppuhn, A., Kunze, R. *et al.* (2019).  
587 Insect egg deposition renders plant defence against hatching larvae more effective in a  
588 salicylic acid-dependent manner. *Plant Cell Environ*, 42, 1019-1032.

589 42.

590 Lucas-Barbosa, D., van Loon, J.J.A., Gols, R., van Beek, T.A., Dicke, M. & Brody, A.  
591 (2013). Reproductive escape: annual plant responds to butterfly eggs by accelerating  
592 seed production. *Funct Ecol*, 27, 245-254.

593 43.

594 Mescher, M.C. & De Moraes, C.M. (2015). Role of plant sensory perception in plant-animal  
595 interactions. *J Exp Bot*, 66, 425-433.

596 44.

597 Mutyambai, D.M., Bruce, T.J., van den Berg, J., Midega, C.A., Pickett, J.A. & Khan, Z.R.  
598 (2016). An Indirect Defence Trait Mediated through Egg-Induced Maize Volatiles  
599 from Neighbouring Plants. *PLoS One*, 11, e0158744.

600 45.

601 Orrock, J.L., Sih, A., Ferrari, M.C., Karban, R., Preisser, E.L., Sheriff, M.J. *et al.* (2015).  
602 Error management in plant allocation to herbivore defense. *Trends Ecol Evol*, 30,  
603 441-445.

604 46.

605 Pashalidou, F.G., Fatouros, N.E., Van Loon, J.J.A., Dicke, M. & Gols, R. (2015a). Plant-  
606 mediated effects of butterfly egg deposition on subsequent caterpillar and pupal  
607 development, across different species of wild Brassicaceae. *Ecol Entomol*, 40, 444-  
608 450.

609 47.

610 Pashalidou, F.G., Frago, E., Griesse, E., Poelman, E.H., van Loon, J.J., Dicke, M. *et al.*  
611 (2015b). Early herbivore alert matters: plant-mediated effects of egg deposition on  
612 higher trophic levels benefit plant fitness. *Ecol Lett*, 18, 927-936.

613 48.

614 Pashalidou, F.G., Gols, R., Berkhout, B.W., Weldegergis, B.T., van Loon, J.J., Dicke, M. *et*  
615 *al.* (2015c). To be in time: egg deposition enhances plant-mediated detection of young  
616 caterpillars by parasitoids. *Oecologia*, 177, 477-486.

617 49.

618 Pashalidou, F.G., Lucas-Barboa, D., van Loon, J.J., Dicke, M. & Fatouros, N.E. (2013).  
619 Phenotypic plasticity of plant response to herbivore eggs: effects on caterpillar  
620 resistance and plant development. *Ecology*, 94, 702-713.


621 50.

622 Peiffer, M., Tooker, J.F., Luthe, D.S. & Felton, G.W. (2009). Plants on early alert: glandular  
623 trichomes as sensors for insect herbivores. *New Phytol*, 184, 644-656.

624 51.


- Pezzola, E., Mancuso, S. & Karban, R. (2017). Precipitation affects plant communication and defense. *Ecology*, 98, 1693-1699.
- 52.
- Schwachtje, J., Minchin, P.E., Jahnke, S., van Dongen, J.T., Schittko, U. & Baldwin, I.T. (2006). SNF1-related kinases allow plants to tolerate herbivory by allocating carbon to roots. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 103, 12935-12940.
- 53.
- Strauss, S.Y. & Agrawal, A.A. (1999). The ecology and evolution of plant tolerance to herbivory. *Trends Ecol Evol*, 14, 179-185.
- 54.
- Sugimoto, K., Matsui, K., Iijima, Y., Akakabe, Y., Muramoto, S., Ozawa, R. *et al.* (2014). Intake and transformation to a glycoside of (Z)-3-hexenol from infested neighbors reveals a mode of plant odor reception and defense. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 111, 7144-7149.
- 55.
- Ton, J., D'Alessandro, M., Jourdie, V., Jakab, G., Karlen, D., Held, M. *et al.* (2007). Priming by airborne signals boosts direct and indirect resistance in maize. *Plant J*, 49, 16-26.
- 56.
- van Hulten, M., Pelser, M., van Loon, L.C., Pieterse, C.M. & Ton, J. (2006). Costs and benefits of priming for defense in *Arabidopsis*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 103, 5602-5607.
- 57.
- Winter, T.R., Borkowski, L., Zeier, J. & Rostas, M. (2012). Heavy metal stress can prime for herbivore-induced plant volatile emission. *Plant Cell Environ*, 35, 1287-1298.
- 58.
- Yip, E.C., De Moraes, C.M., Mescher, M.C., Tooker, J.F. & Rasmann, S. (2017). The volatile emission of a specialist herbivore alters patterns of plant defence, growth and flower production in a field population of goldenrod. *Funct Ecol*, 31, 1062-1070.
- 59.
- Zangerl, A.R. & Rutledge, C.E. (1996). The probability of attack and patterns of constitutive and induced defense: a test of optimal defense theory. *Am Nat*, 147, 599-608.
- 60.
- Zhang, P.J., Wei, J.N., Zhao, C., Zhang, Y.F., Li, C.Y., Liu, S.S. *et al.* (2019). Airborne host-plant manipulation by whiteflies via an inducible blend of plant volatiles. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 116, 7387-7396.

662 **FIGURES**  
663 **Figure 1:** The different treatments used throughout this study were generated through exposure to  
664 direct egg infestation, oviposition-induced volatiles or volatiles from neighboring control plants.  
665 Control plants were exposed to neither volatiles from other plants nor eggs. Plants were maintained  
666 under each of these conditions for 5 days (until just before larval emergence) before use in different  
667 experiments. To generate the damaged and undamaged treatments, larvae were added to subsets of  
668 these plants and allowed to feed for a total of 7 days. The shorthand treatment codes used  
669 throughout the manuscript are given.  
670  
671







**Figure 2.** Effects of exposure to oviposition-induced plant volatiles or cumene on plant palatability to a specialist herbivore. As a proxy for relative investment in defense, caterpillar weight was measured three and seven days after feeding on *Brassica oleracea* (a,b) and *Brassica nigra* (c,d). Bars represent mean larval biomass ( $\pm 1 \times$  S.E.);  $n = 10$  plants per treatment. Treatments in (a,c): egg-infested plants (E); control plants (C); receiver of volatiles from control plants (Rc); receiver of egg-infested plant volatiles (Re). Treatments in plots (b,d): receiver of hexane solvent (He); and receiver of cumene emissions (Cu). Letters indicate significant differences among treatments (as assessed by Tukey's test).



**Figure 3:** Variation in emission of the volatile compound significantly induced by egg infestation in each of the *Brassica* species. (a) Cumene emissions were significantly elevated for egg-infested *Brassica oleracea* plants. (b)  $\beta$ -thujene emissions were significantly elevated for egg-infested *Brassica nigra* plants. Mean volatile emissions per treatment were calculated as mean peak area  $\pm 1 \times$  S.E. / g fresh weight of foliage divided by  $10^4$  the  $n$  of samples. Treatments: control plants (C); receiver of volatiles from control plants (Rc); egg-infested plants (E); receiver of egg-infested plant volatiles (Re). Cross hatching indicates where plants were additionally exposed to larval feeding for 7 days. Letters indicate significant differences among treatments (Tukey's test,  $P < 0.05$ ).



**Figure 4.** Effect of exposure to *P. brassicae* oviposition and oviposition-induced volatiles on reproduction and fitness traits of *Brassica nigra*, including: (a) Mean flower number; (b) mean leaf number; (c) mean number of seeds produced; (d) mean germination rate. Error bars represent +/- one standard error. Treatments: control plants (C); egg-infested plants (E); receiver of egg-infested plant volatiles (Re). Cross hatching indicates where plants were additionally exposed to feeding larvae (until larval pupation). Letters indicate significant differences among treatments, with 10 replicate plants per treatment (60 in total).



**Figure 5:** Oviposition-induced plant volatiles prime defenses in *Brassica nigra*, but also elicit changes in life history strategy, including a shift from investment in growth to reproduction. Photo credit: Rupesh Kariyat.

